Case 2:20-cv-01729-TLN-KJN Document 5 Filed 10/05/20 Page 1 of 4 **BUCHALTER** 1 A Professional Corporation KEVIN COLLINS (SBN: 185427) ALISSA PLEAU-FULLER (SBN: 258907) 3 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1900 Sacramento, CA 95814 Tel: (916) 945-5170 4 Email: kcollins@buchalter.com 5 apleaufuller@buchalter.com 6 Attorneys for Defendants FRANCISCO J. ZANGEROLAME, PHYSICIANS WELLNESS GROUP INC., JAREOU HOLDING, LLC, NUVERUS USA, INC., 8 MICHAEL JAREOU. FRANCISCO J. ZANGEROLAME, CURTIS CRUZ 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 12 13 RANIF CO. dba INVISIBLE DEFENDER, CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01729-TLN-KJN Plaintiff, 14 STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO 15 VS. INITIAL COMPLAINT BY MORE PHYSICIAN WELLNESS GROUP, INC., THAN 28 DAYS PURSUANT TO LOCAL JAREOU HOLDING, LLC, NUVERUS USA, **RULE 144 (A)** INC. MICHAEL JAREOU, FRANCISCO J. 17 ZANGEROLAME, CURTIS CRUZ and DOES 18 1-100, inclusive. Defendants. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1

10 11

9

12 13

15

16

14

17 18

19 20

22

23

21

24 25

26

27

28 BUCHALTER

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION SACRAMENTO

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Plaintiff Ranif Co. dba Invisible
Defender, a Nevada corporation ("Plaintiff"), and Francisco J. Zangerolame ("Zangerolame"),
Physicians Wellness Group Inc. (erroneously sued herein as Physician Wellness Group, Inc.), a
Texas corporation, Jareou Holding, LLC, a Texas limited liability company, Nuverus USA, Inc.
("Nuverus"), a Delaware corporation, Michael Jareou, and Curtis Cruz (collectively, "Defendants")
(Plaintiff and Defendants are hereby referred to collectively, as the "Parties") by and through their
respective counsel of record, stipulate as follows:

- 1. On July 31, 2020, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing an unverified Complaint for damages and other relief in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of El Dorado entitled Ranif Co. dba Invisible Defender v. Physician Wellness Group, Inc. et al., and Does 1 through 100, inclusive, Case No. PC20200371 ("Complaint").
- 2. Plaintiff personally served Zangerolame on August 11, 2020, and Nuverus on August 12, 2020.
- 3. On August 27, 2020, Zangerolame filed a Notice of Removal and on August 28, 2020, and the case was removed from state court to this Court. Moreover, the last date to remand the case was September 28, 2020 and the case has not been remanded or requested to be remanded.
- 4. Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 81(c), Zangerolame and Nuverus' responsive pleadings were due on September 3 and 4, 2020, respectively.
- 5. Pursuant to Local Rule 144(a), the parties may file a stipulation with an extension to file a responsive pleading for 28 days, but an order is required for any additional time requested beyond that.
 - 6. The Parties have not previously requested an extension for any party to respond.
- 7. The Parties, through their attorneys, have engaged in discussions, and Defendants' counsel recently notified Plaintiff that they were recently retained to represent all Defendants (absent the DOE defendants) in this matter, and that Defendants' counsel will accept service on behalf of all Defendants that have not yet been served, and, in exchange, Plaintiff agreed to stipulate to the requested extension of time to respond for all Defendants to respond to the complaint.¹

¹ This Stipulation and any acceptance of service by counsel for Defendants does not waive any

Case 2:20-cv-01729-TLN-KJN Document 5 Filed 10/05/20 Page 3 of 4

1	8. As such, an additional extension of time for each of the Defendants to file	a
2	responsive pleading to the Complaint within the earlier date of the following: (1) 21 days from t	he
3	date of the Court's Order granting this Stipulation, or (2) October 26, 2020, is warranted and in t	he
4	interests of bringing all parties into the action. This will involve an extension of at least 53 da	ys
5	for Zangerolame and 54 days for Nuverus, who were already served in the state court matter.	
6	9. WHEREFORE, the Parties respectfully request that the Court enter the propos	ed
7	Order extending the date for each of the Defendants to respond to the Complaint to the earlier	of
8	the following: (1) 21 days from the date of the Court's Order granting this Stipulation, or ((2)
9	October 26, 2020.	
10		
11		
12	Dated: October 2, 2020 BUCHALTER A Professional Corporation	
13		
14	By: /s/ Kevin 1. Collins	
15	KEVIN COLLINS ALISSA PLEAU-FULLER	
16	FRANCISCO J. ZANGEROLAME,	
17	JAREOU HOLDING, LLC, NUVERUS USA	PHYSICIANS WELLNESS GROUP INC., JAREOU HOLDING, LLC, NUVERUS USA,
18	INC., MICHAEL JAREOU, FRANCISCO J. ZANGEROLAME, CURTIS CRUZ	
19	Dated: October 2, 2020 MICHELMAN & ROBINSON, LLP	MICHELMAN & ROBINSON, LLP
20		
21		
22	By: <u>/s/ Samantha Gavin</u> SAMANTHA GAVIN	_
23	Attorneys for Plaintiff RANIF CO. DBA INVISIBLE DEFENDER	ξ.
24		
25		
26		
personal jurisdiction over any of the Defendar	applicable objections or defenses based on a lack of jurisdiction, including, but not limited to, personal jurisdiction over any of the Defendants.	
28		

BUCHALTER
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
SACRAMENTO

Case 2:20-cv-01729-TLN-KJN Document 5 Filed 10/05/20 Page 4 of 4

ORDER

Upon consideration of the Stipulation to Extend Time to Respond to Initial Complaint by More Than 28 Days (the "Joint Stipulation") filed by the Parties, through their attorneys in this action, and good cause having been shown, it is hereby ORDERED:

- 1. That the Joint Stipulation is Granted; and
- 2. That the time for each of the Defendants to respond to the Complaint be and hereby is extended by the earlier of the following: (1) by 21 days from the date of this Order, or (2) October 26, 2020.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 5, 2020

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge